

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/723,263

Applicant(s)

MATHIEU ET AL.

Examiner

Livius Cazan

Art Unit

3729

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) David P. Bryant.(3) N. Kenneth Burraston (app's rep).(2) Livius Cazan.(4) Scott Hauser (app's rep).

Date of Interview: 27 April 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: Sample probe card was shown to demonstrate the application of the invention.

Claim(s) discussed: Proposed amended claims 1 and 21, and proposed new claim 37.

Identification of prior art discussed: Kubo et al. (US 5656798), Pierce (US 3384955).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



DAVID P. BRYANT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed proposed amended claims, and whether they define over the Kubo et al. reference. It was agreed that limitations pertaining to the exposed walls of the hole being non-conductive would define over Kubo et al. However, in further discussions, it was pointed out by Examiner Cazan that the Pierce reference appears to anticipate the proposed amended claims (note Figure 4b). Participants were unable to agree on explicit language to define the claims over Pierce.